

## STATE PLAN ISSUES

*The issues identified in this document are a reflection of the knowledge and background of the writing team members; consequently, the list should not be considered comprehensive.*

- **State workforce investment board.** Should the board be advisory or policy-making?
- **Local workforce investment board appointments.**
  - Does the head of a state agency have the authority to approve the selection of agency employees at the local level to serve on local boards?
  - Can an individual from a one-stop partner represent multiple services provided by that partner? For example: 1) a board member from a community or technical college may represent both postsecondary and adult education; 2) a local DES staff member may represent multiple programs provided by the agency.
- **One-stop Centers**
  - **Co-location.** What is the expectation for co-location of one-stop partners?
  - **Existing centers.** Should the state mandate that current centers remain in existence?
  - **Satellite center.** Must each satellite center provide a minimum set of core services?
  - **Point of contact.** Will the state mandate that the same core service partner be the first point of contact for every customer?
- **Funding**
  - **Core and/or Intensive Services.** Should one-stop partners who provide core and/or intensive services use their normal funding sources, or may WIA funding be used to provide these services? Under what circumstances may WIA funding be used?
  - **Hold harmless provision.** For program years 1999 and 2000, should the state include a provision that holds local areas harmless against a reduction during the transition from JTPA to WIA? If so, at what percentage should the hold harmless protection be invoked?
  - **Allocation.** Ten percent of each of three funding categories (adult, dislocated workers, youth) is reserved to activities other than administration at the state-level. Potential allocations include one or more of the categories noted above or state-level projects such as WIA system development (including start-up costs) or innovative projects. How should these funds be directed?
- **Waivers.** Should the state consider requesting waivers of certain DOL regulations? Specifically, should the state request a waiver of the requirement that employees allocate their time among the federal programs which they administer?

- **Information Gaps in the Plan**
  - ***Align practice with vision.*** The plan emphasizes current and past practice, but does not fully articulate how the state plans to change current practice to reach the goals identified in the mission.
  - ***Performance measures and benchmarks.*** The plan now includes only those performance measures required by the Act. Should the state consider additional measures of performance? How will the state set benchmarks for each indicator? How are the expectations for increased performance determined? Are local providers/one-stop operators expected to meet all performance benchmarks or some portion of them, e.g., can providers meet 80% of performance benchmarks and be considered successful?
- **Weaknesses and Barriers.** How does the state plan to address the following weaknesses and barriers?
  - state-controlled facilities management – prescriptive requirements for office design and length of time to complete bid process
  - LRC review of agreements – adds to an already lengthy review process
  - technology – software and hardware incompatibility, lack of knowledge and capacity of users and managers, lack technical support personnel and staff training, lack of timely implementation of technology projects.
  - personnel systems – Do one-stop operators who are not state employees have the authority to supervise state employees? Does the one-stop operator from one state agency have the authority to supervise staff employed by other state agencies?
  - hours of operation – traditional state government hours of operation are inflexible and do not meet customers’ needs
  - data sharing/matching – barriers across various state government agencies, private and for-profit entities make data sharing and matching difficult
  - local agency authorization – agency staff at the local level are not permitted to make decisions within existing department policies